UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/561,380 | 08/28/2006 | Todd Garrett Simpson | 037652.00050 | 6475 |

26712 7590 03/16/2009

HODGSON RUSS LLP
THE GUARANTY BUILDING
140 PEARL STREET
SUITE 100
BUFFALO, NY 14202-4040

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| WRIGHT, BRYAN F | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2431 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 03/16/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/561,380 | SIMPSON, TODD GARRETT | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | BRYAN WRIGHT | 2431 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 December 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is response to Amendment filed 12/22/2008.

2. Claims (1-26) are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouse et al. (US Patent No. 6,983,310 and Rouse hereinafter) in view of Bradford et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0247915 and Bradford hereinafter).

4. As to claim 1, Rouse teaches a information identification system, comprising:

a first information-search software module which includes executable instructions to identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching function provided through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

a second information-search software module (e.g., calendar module) which includes executable instructions to identify a second set of information corresponding

(e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53-65);

and a user interface, capable of providing the sets of information to the user such that the first set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the second set of information (310, fig. 3).

Rouse does not teach:

a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user;

a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user, the types of data being selected from a list of possible types of data based on input from the user;

a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions being selected from a list of possible actions;

a processor, capable of executing at least one of the software modules;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user (to provide a device having a display and user information input mechanism (par. 28));

a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user (to provide a menu containment of possible user selectable elements (par. 40)), the types of data being selected from a list (e.g., menu) of possible types of data based on input from the user (to provide selectable menu element capability (par. 40));

a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions being selected from a list of possible actions (to provide executable software means for identifying a user action corresponding to a selectable menu elements (par. 41));

a processor, capable of executing at least one of the software modules (to provide the capability for a plurality of software modules to execute on a processor [fig. 2]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of predictive word and user

action as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

5. As to claim 2, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is providing input.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is providing input (to provide the capability to identify the setting mode of an user environment [par. 44]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of identifying a user environment setting mode as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 44].

6. As to claim 3, Rouse teaches a system where the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment (e.g., calendar module) [col. 10, lines 53-60].

7. As to claim 4, Rouse teaches a system where the types of data include phone numbers (col. 9, lines 45- 55).

8. As to claim 5, Rouse teaches a system where the types of data include universal resource locators (col. 17, lines 1-6).

9. As to claim 6, Rouse teaches a system where the types of data include names of human beings (col. 9, lines 45-55).

10. As to claim 7, Rouse teaches a system where the types of data include names of locations (col. 9, lines 45-55).

11. As to claim 8, Rouse teaches a system the types of data include searching addresses (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., address) [col. 7, lines 35-41]).

12. As to claim 9, Rouse teaches a system where the valid actions include searching a data base of phone numbers (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., phone number) [col. 9, lines 35-41]).

13. As to claim 10, Rouse teaches a system where the valid actions include searching a data base of universal resource locators (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., URL) [col. 9, lines 35-41]).

14. As to claim 11, Rouse teaches a system where the valid actions include searching a data base of names of human beings (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., persons) [col. 9, lines 35-41]).

15. As to claim 12, Rouse teaches a system where the valid actions include searching a data base of names of locations (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation

such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., location) [col. 9, lines 35-41]).

16. As to claim 13, Rouse teaches a system where the valid actions include searching a data base of addresses (i.e., ... teaches a search module for performing user initiated searches [422, fig. 4] ... further teaches a string input operation such that the user is able to enter search criteria for specific types of data (e.g., address) [col. 9, lines 35-41]).

17. As to claim 14, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

18. As to claims 15 and 16, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A system further comprising a duplicate-identifier software module, which includes executable instructions to identify duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information (claim 15).

A system where the duplicate-identifier software module includes executable instructions to remove the duplicate information from the second set of information (claim 16).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system further comprising a duplicate-identifier software module, which includes executable instructions to identify duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information (to provide duplication suppression means [par. 146]) (claim 15).

A system where the duplicate-identifier software module includes executable instructions to remove the duplicate information from the second set of information (to provide the capability to remove duplicate information [par. 146]) (claim 16).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of removing duplicate list elements as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 146].

19. As to claim 17, although the teaching of Rouse discloses substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not disclose:

A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of

information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide learning capability for user preference [par. 40; par. 43]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of learning a user action for purpose of predictive correlation as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40; par. 43].

20. As to claim 18, Rouse teaches a method of identifying information, comprising:

to identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching function through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

to identify a second set of information corresponding (e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53-65);

providing the sets of information to the user such that the first set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the second set of information (310, fig. 3).

Rouse does not teach:

receive input from a user;

identify types of data that might be returned to the user, the types of data being selected from a list of possible types of data based on input from the user;

identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions being selected from a list of possible actions;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

to receive input from a user (to provide a device having a display and user information input mechanism (par. 28));

identify types of data that might be returned to the user (to provide a menu containment structure for possible user selectable elements (par. 40)), the types of data being selected from a list (e.g., menu) of possible types of data based on input from the user (to provide user selectable menu elements (par. 40));

identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the valid actions being selected from a list of possible actions (to provide executable software means for identifying a user action corresponding to a selectable menu elements (par. 41));

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of predictive word and user action capability as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

21. As to claim 19, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A method further comprising identifying an environment in which the user is providing input.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising identifying an environment in which the user is providing input (to provide the capability to identify the setting mode of a user environment [par. 44]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of identifying a user environment setting mode as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 44].

22. As to claim 20, Rouse teaches further comprising identifying an environment and selecting types of data based on the environment (col. 10, lines 53-65).

23. As to claim 21, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

24. As to claims 22 and 23, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A method further comprising identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information (claim 22).

A method further comprising removing the duplicate information from the second set of information (claim 23).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information (to provide duplication suppression means [par. 146]) (claim 22).

A method further comprising removing the duplicate information from the second set of information (to provide the capability to remove duplicate information [par. 146]) (claim 23).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of removing duplicate list elements as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

25. As to claims 24-26, although the teaching of Rouse discloses substantial features of the claim invention, however the teaching or Rouse does not disclose:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (claim 26).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide user preference tracking capability [par. 43]) (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (to provide user input tracking capability [par. 40]) (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (to provide the capability to track previous entries action performed by a user [par. 40]) (claim 26).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of

modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of user action tracking as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant Remarks, filed 12/22/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-26 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Rouse and Bradford.

With regards to applicant's antecedent basis argument, Examiner finds applicant's arguments persuasive and respectfully withdraws 112, 2nd paragraph rejection for claims 25 and 26.

**Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is (571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431